

Information Services Board Meeting Minutes – March 10, 2005

Department of Information Services Boardroom, the Forum Building
Olympia, Washington

Members Present:

Tom Clarke
Marty Daybell
Tom Fitzsimmons
Ross Hunter
Ed Lazowska
Gary Robinson
Fred Stephens

Members Absent:

Glenn Anderson
Luke Esser
Jayasri Guha
Earl Heister
D.J. Mark

Roll Call

A sufficient number of members were present to constitute a quorum.

Approval of the Consent Agenda

The Consent Agenda was approved, which included the following:

- January 13, 2005 Minutes.
- SIEC Phase 2 Inventory of Public Safety Communications Systems.
- Appointment of John Batiste and Gary Robinson to the SIEC.
- IT Security Standards Revision.
- Retirement of Year 2000 Date Field Compliance and Certification Policy.

Board Member Change

Tom Fitzsimmons welcomed Gary Robinson as the new Director of the Department of Information Services. Mr. Fitzsimmons also announced that Tom Clarke will be resigning from the Board at the end of March and Janet McLane from the Administrative Office of the Courts will be his replacement on the Board.

ISB Policy Compliance Report

Andy Hix, DIS, reported that over 90% of the agencies are in compliance with ISB policies. To be in compliance an agency must update and submit their portfolio, update and test their disaster recovery business resumption plan, update and test their security policy, have their security plan and practices audited every three years, and submit a letter signed by their director certifying that their agency is in compliance in each area.

Staff recommended that the Board remove delegated authority

for those agencies that are not in compliance, with the provision that the DIS Deputy Director may restore it once the agency becomes compliant.

Motion: The Board moved to revoke the delegated authority of the agencies listed in the staff report as not compliant with IT policy and standards, and that the authority be reinstated by the DIS Deputy upon agency certification of compliance. This revocation of authority applies to new obligations to pay, new contracts, and new acquisitions of goods and services. It does not affect ongoing operational expenditures or project activities separately approved by the Board. The motion passed.

**Department of Corrections
Offender Management Network
Information Systems Status
Report**

Tom Wallace, DIS, reported that in late January the Department of Corrections (DOC) and IBM reached a point of disagreement regarding scope. The resolution of this disagreement resulted in a significant delay to the project schedule.

Mr. Wallace recommended that IBM develop contingency plans and mitigation strategies for preventing further schedule slippage. He also recommended that DOC deliver a report to the Board prior to the May meeting, outlining their response to the Governor's review. His final recommendation was that DOC develop a thorough investment plan for Phase 3. This plan should be reviewed by DIS and approved by the ISB.

Kathy Pickens-Rucker, DOC's project manager for OMNI, gave an update on the project's progress. She announced that originally the project had 17 defined performance requirements. After scope analysis, however, 10 of the requirements were eliminated as not appropriate for Phase 2 testing. She also stated that currently the data model is experiencing continual change due to characteristics around data elements, but will be frozen on March 15.

In April the project will port the code to the mainframe, and commence performance testing. The project will also complete the design and physical data model walk-through at this time, and complete training for user acceptance testers, so that user testing can begin in May.

Tracy Guerin, Deputy Secretary for DOC, assured the Board that DOC has a business case for Phase 3.

The Board requested documentation on the 17 original performance test standards. They also requested that DOC return in May to discuss the management structure and business case for Phase 3, as well as the oversight, quality assurance, and role of DIS on this project.

**Enterprise Architecture
Committee**

Greg Brant, DIS, gave a brief review of the Enterprise Architecture Committee's (EA) purpose and committee structure.

He stated the EA has adopted the National Association of State Chief Information Officers (NASCIO) framework as the basis for a modified framework for Washington state. They chose the NASCIO framework because many of its components are similar to the federal government architecture, and because its design is similar to the architecture used in many state agencies.

The EA is currently working on an enterprise architecture governance structure.

Two early adopters of the enterprise effort are the Financial Systems Roadmap project and the Geographic Information Technology (GIT) architecture effort. The Financial Roadmap project is a multi-agency endeavor that is incorporating the EA principles previously approved by the Board. The GIT effort has identified objectives in its strategic plan and determined the impact of those objectives on the architecture. The GIT is currently identifying common data sets in order to improve the ability to share geospatial data across multiple agencies.

The EA is currently discussing membership and seeking potential candidates for participation.

**University of Washington Online
Record of Clinical Activity
Project Status Report**

Andy Marcelia, DIS, reported that the University of Washington's (UW) Online Record of Clinical Activity (ORCA) project was approved by DIS in May of 2000. The estimated cost was \$10.3 million and it was assessed as a level 1 project. Subsequent changes in scope and budget occurred; the project is now a level 3.

Mr. Marcelia recommended the following: that the ISB continue to freeze the UW's delegated authority on the ORCA project; that the UW present an approved investment plan to the ISB for completion of the ORCA project; that the UW should be instructed to adopt new IT investment procedures consistent with portfolio management; that the UW establish a central point of IT investment accountability which includes internal management of the University's delegated authority; and finally, that restoration of delegated authority be contingent upon ORCA satisfying all of the above requirements.

Tom Martin, CIO of UW Medicine, reported that UW had received approval for the project from both Harborview and the University Hospital Board before presenting to the Board of Regents for approval.

In response to the RFP release, Cerner Corporation was selected as the vendor.

The first phase went live in 2002. The acceptance issues and instability of the system required additional attention.

In January 2004, UW reduced maintenance payments to Cerner Corporation because of quality issues. In August 2004, payments were stopped because two modules were late. Then UW and Cerner began renegotiations for the project's final phases.

Mr. Martin reported many lessons have been learned from the project so far. He acknowledged that the project should have sequenced the products differently and they should have taken Cerner Corporation's products without modifications. He also recommended incremental implementations instead of large-scale deliveries.

Currently UW is considering a contract amendment that would shorten the project timeline by changing the approach. They will present that contract amendment to the ISB at a future date.

Motion: The Board moved to:

- Freeze the medical center's delegation of expenditure authority for the ORCA project.
- Require UW to return with an investment plan that has been approved by the Board of Regents, including the investment strategy and assignment of a third party quality assurance vendor.
- Require UW to adopt investment procedures consistent with ISB portfolio management approaches.
- Require UW to establish a central point of organizational accountability for IT investments.
- Require that UW prepare and deliver a reconciliation report of the budget with contract deliverables for presentation to the Board.

Restoration of delegated authority will be contingent on the requirements being met. The motion passed.

**Department of Personnel Human
Resource Management System
Status Report**

Tom Parma, DIS, reported that the Department of Personnel (DOP) is being extremely deliberate in the Human Resource Management System (HRMS) replanning effort. Part of that effort includes a renegotiation with Accenture regarding scope, and work plan impact.

Mr. Parma reported that there is evidence that DOP and Accenture are focusing on the three most recent quality assurance recommendations. The project is holding team members accountable to the estimates made as per recommendation 53. They are scheduling a minimum of two months between releases as directed in recommendation 51, and they are not publishing new release dates until specific

conditions regarding key policy issues are met.

Gene Matt, DOP Director, reported that they are currently involved in contract amendment discussions with Accenture.

Brian Turner, HRMS Project Manager for DOP, updated the ISB on the replanning effort. The project team is restructuring their project management strategy to reflect effective resource utilization, tighter scope controls, an updated project plan, and monitoring compliance processes.

Mr. Turner also stated that they are reducing the software changes to Pay One and that agencies will have to review their internal systems to determine if any modifications need to be made prior to July 1 to implement the Civil Service Reform rules.

ISB Policy Development Process

Leroy Hurt, DIS, reported that in the 01-03 Biennium there were 26 level two and level three projects. Of those, three were canceled. The cancellation rate of 11.5% was below the national average as published by the Standish Group of 15%.

Mr. Hurt explained that policy and standards are sets of documents that are mandatory and require compliance. Guidelines and tools are optional and are usually considered best practices in the industry.

There is a four phase process for developing and updating policies. These include the drafting phase, revision phase, endorsement phase, and the review and compliance phase. Stakeholders have an opportunity to impact the process during each phase.

The ISB staff has changed the format of the documents to improve accessibility. They have added a numbering scheme to assist with cross-referencing and are currently adding an improved search capability to make particular information easier to find.

Gary Robinson commented that he would like to see more clarity in the policy language. Susan Hettinger committed to improving the language in the suite of policies and standards in the next year at which time the staff will present improved, easier-to-read, policies to the ISB.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.